arXiv:1701.04509v1 [math.AG] 17 Jan 2017

A GENERALIZATION OF THE HASSE-WITT MATRIX OF A HYPERSURFACE

ALAN ADOLPHSON AND STEVEN SPERBER

Abstract. The Hasse-Witt matrix of a hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^n$ over a finite field of characteristic p gives essentially complete mod p information about the zeta function of the hypersurface. But if the degree d of the hypersurface is $\le n$, the zeta function is trivial mod p and the Hasse-Witt matrix is zero-by-zero. We generalize a classical formula for the Hasse-Witt matrix to obtain a matrix that gives a nontrivial congruence for the zeta function for all d. We also describe the differential equations satisfied by this matrix and prove that it is generically invertible.

1. Introduction

Let p be a prime number, let $q = p^a$, and let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be the field of q elements. Let

$$f_\lambda(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda_j x^{\mathbf{a}_j} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_0, \dots, x_n] \tag{1.1}$$

be a homogeneous polynomial of degree d. We write $\mathbf{a}_j = (a_{0j}, \dots, a_{nj})$ with $\sum_{i=0}^n a_{ij} = d$. Let $X_\lambda \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$ be the hypersurface defined by the equation $f_\lambda(x) = 0$ and let $Z(X_\lambda/\mathbb{F}_q, t)$ be its zeta function. We write

$$Z(X_\lambda/\mathbb{F}_q, t) = \frac{P_\lambda(t)^{(-1)^n}}{(1-t)(1-qt)\cdots(1-q^{n-1}t)} \tag{1.2}$$

for some rational function $P_\lambda(t) \in 1 + t\mathbb{Z}[[t]]$. If $d = 1$ then $P_\lambda(t) = 1$, so we shall always assume that $d \ge 2$.

Define a nonnegative integer μ by the equation

$$\left\lceil \frac{n+1}{d} \right\rceil = \mu + 1,$$

where $\lceil r \rceil$ denotes the least integer greater than or equal to the real number r. By a result of Ax[4] (see also Katz[5, Proposition 2.4]) we have

$$P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \in 1 + t\mathbb{Z}[[t]].$$

Date: January 18, 2017.

Our goal in this paper is to give a mod p congruence for $P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t)$. We do this by defining a generalization of the classical Hasse-Witt matrix, which gives such a congruence for $\mu = 0$. Presumably our matrix is the matrix of a "higher Hasse-Witt" operation as defined by Katz[6, Section 2.3.4], but so far we have not been able to prove this.

It will be convenient to define an augmentation of the vectors $\mathbf{a}_j$. Set

$$\mathbf{a}_j^+ = (a_{0j}, \dots, a_{nj}, 1) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N,$$

where $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the nonnegative integers. Note that the vectors $\mathbf{a}_j^+$ all lie on the hyperplane $\sum_{i=0}^n u_i = du_{n+1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}$. We shall be interested in the lattice points on this hyperplane that lie in $(\mathbb{R}_{>0})^{n+2}$: set

$$U = \biggl\{ u = (u_0, \dots, u_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2} \mid \sum_{i=0}^n u_i = du_{n+1} \text{ and } u_i > 0 \text{ for all } i \biggr\}.$$

Note that $u \in U$ implies that $u_{n+1} \geq \mu + 1$. Let

$$U_{\min} = \{u = (u_0, \dots, u_{n+1}) \in U \mid u_{n+1} = \mu + 1\},$$

a nonempty set by the definition of μ. We define a matrix of polynomials with rows and columns indexed by $U_{\min}$: let $A(\Lambda) = [A_{uv}(\Lambda)]_{u,v \in U_{\min}}$, where

$$A_{uv}(\Lambda) = (-1)^{\mu+1} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^N \\ \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = pu - v}} \frac{\Lambda_1^{\nu_1} \cdots \Lambda_N^{\nu_N}}{\nu_1! \cdots \nu_N!} \in \mathbb{Q}[\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_N].$$

Note that since the $(n+1)$-st coordinate of each $\mathbf{a}_j^+$ equals 1, the condition on the summation implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j = (p-1)(\mu+1).$$

When $\mu = 0$, it follows that $\nu_j \leq p-1$ for all j, hence the matrix $A(\Lambda)$ can be reduced modulo p. We denote by $\bar{A}(\Lambda) \in \mathbb{F}_p[\Lambda]$ its reduction modulo p. Using the algorithm of Katz[6, Algorithm 2.3.7.14], one then checks that $\bar{A}(\lambda)$ is the Hasse-Witt matrix of the hypersurface $f_\lambda = 0$. It is somewhat surprising that even when $\mu > 0$ we still have $\nu_j \leq p-1$ for all j.

Lemma 1.3. *If $u, v \in U_{\min}$, $\nu \in \mathbb{N}^N$, and $\sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = pu - v$, then $\nu_j \leq p-1$ for all j. In particular, $A_{uv}(\Lambda) \in (\mathbb{Q} \cap \mathbb{Z}_p)[\Lambda]$, so $A_{uv}(\Lambda)$ can be reduced modulo p.*

The proof of Lemma 1.3 will be given in Section 2. By the results of [1, Theorem 2.7 or Theorem 3.1], which will be recalled in Section 2, Lemma 1.3 implies immediately that each $A_{uv}(\Lambda)$ is a mod p solution of an A-hypergeometric system of differential equations.

Write the rational function $P_\lambda(t)$ of (1.2) as

$$P_\lambda(t) = \frac{Q_\lambda(t)}{R_\lambda(t)},$$

where $Q_\lambda(t)$ and $R_\lambda(t)$ are relatively prime polynomials with

$$Q_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t),\ R_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \in 1 + t\mathbb{Z}[t].$$

If X_λ is smooth, it is known that $P_\lambda(t)$ is a polynomial, i. e., $R_\lambda(t) = 1$. Our main result is the following, which does not require any smoothness assumption.

Theorem 1.4. *If n is not divisible by d, then $R_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv 1 \pmod q$ and*

$$Q_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv \det\left(I - t\bar{A}(\lambda^{p^{a-1}})\bar{A}(\lambda^{p^{a-2}})\cdots\bar{A}(\lambda)\right) \pmod p.$$

Note that even in the classical case of the Hasse-Witt matrix ($\mu = 0$), this result contains something new, as we do not assume that X_λ is a smooth hypersurface.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 will occupy Sections 3–5. To describe the zeta function, we apply the p-adic cohomology theory of Dwork, as in Katz[7, Sections 4–6]. Indeed, Equation (3.5) below is a refined version of [7, Equation (4.5.33)]. We discuss the case $d \mid n$ in Section 6. If $d \mid n$, the conclusion of Theorem 1.4 need not hold, and the rational function $P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \pmod p$ is instead described by Theorem 6.2. We prove the generic invertibility of the matrix $\bar{A}(\Lambda)$ in Section 7.

2. Proof of Lemma 1.3

It will be convenient for later applications to prove a more general version of Lemma 1.3. Put $S = \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ and let $I \subseteq S$. Define an integer μ_I by the equation

$$\left\lceil \frac{|I|}{d} \right\rceil = \mu_I + 1.$$

Note that $\mu_I \geq 0$ if $I \neq \emptyset$, $\mu_\emptyset = -1$, and, in the notation of the Introduction, $\mu_S = \mu$. Set

$$U^I = \left\{ u = (u_0, \ldots, u_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2} \mid \sum_{i=0}^{n} u_i = du_{n+1} \text{ and } u_i > 0 \text{ for all } i \in I \right\}.$$

Note that $u \in U^I$ implies that $u_{n+1} \geq \mu_I + 1$. Let

$$U^I_{\min} = \{u = (u_0, \dots, u_{n+1}) \in U^I \mid u_{n+1} = \mu_I + 1\},$$

a nonempty set by the definition of μ_I. Lemma 1.3 is the special case $I = S$ of the following result.

Lemma 2.1. *If $u, v \in U^I_{\min}$, $\nu \in \mathbb{N}^N$, and $\sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = pu - v$, then $\nu_j \leq p - 1$ for all j.*

Proof. The result is trivial when $I = \emptyset$ since $U^\emptyset_{\min} = \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$, so assume $I \neq \emptyset$. Let $u = (u_0, \dots, u_n, \mu_I + 1), v = (v_0, \dots, v_n, \mu_I + 1) \in U^I_{\min}$. Fix $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. We claim there exists an index $i_0 \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$a_{i_0 k} \geq \begin{cases} u_{i_0} & \text{if } i_0 \in I, \\ u_{i_0} + 1 & \text{if } i_0 \notin I. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

For if (2.2) fails for all $i_0 \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, then

$$u - \mathbf{a}_k^+ = (u_0 - a_{0k}, \dots, u_n - a_{nk}, \mu_I) \in U^I,$$

contradicting the definition of μ_I.

If $\nu_k \geq p$, then

$$\nu_k a_{i_0 k} \geq p a_{i_0 k} \geq \begin{cases} p u_{i_0} & \text{if } i_0 \in I, \\ p u_{i_0} + p & \text{if } i_0 \notin I, \end{cases}$$

hence in both cases we have

$$\nu_k a_{i_0 k} > p u_{i_0} - v_{i_0}.$$

But our hypothesis $\sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = pu - v$ implies that

$$\nu_k a_{i_0 k} \leq p u_{i_0} - v_{i_0}.$$

This contradiction shows that $\nu_k \leq p - 1$. And since k was arbitrary, the lemma is established. □

We recall the definition of the A-hypergeometric system of differential equations associated to the set $A = \{\mathbf{a}_j^+\}_{j=1}^N$. Let $L \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^N$ be the lattice of relations on A,

$$L = \left\{ l = (l_1, \dots, l_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N \mid \sum_{j=1}^N l_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = \mathbf{0} \right\},$$

and let $\beta = (\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n+2}$. The A-hypergeometric system with parameter β is the system of partial differential operators in variables

$\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_N$ consisting of the box operators

$$\Box_l = \prod_{l_j>0} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_j}\right)^{l_j} - \prod_{l_j<0} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_j}\right)^{-l_j} \quad \text{for } l \in L$$

and the Euler (or homogeneity) operators

$$Z_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}\Lambda_j \frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_j} - \beta_i \quad \text{for } i = 0, \ldots, n$$

and

$$Z_{n+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \Lambda_j \frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda_j} - \beta_{n+1}.$$

Let $A^I(\Lambda) = [A^I_{uv}(\Lambda)]_{u,v \in U^I_{\min}}$, where

$$A^I_{uv}(\Lambda) = (-1)^{\mu_I+1} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^N \\ \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = pu-v}} \frac{\Lambda_1^{\nu_1} \cdots \Lambda_N^{\nu_N}}{\nu_1! \cdots \nu_N!} \in \mathbb{Q}[\Lambda_1, \ldots, \Lambda_N]. \tag{2.3}$$

Note that in the notation of the Introduction we have $A^S_{uv}(\Lambda) = A_{uv}(\Lambda)$. By Lemma 2.1, the polynomials $A^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$ have p-integral coefficients. Lemma 2.1 also says that $pu - v$ is very good in the sense of [1, Section 2]. We may therefore apply [1, Theorem 2.7] (or [1, Theorem 3.1] since this system is nonconfluent) to conclude that $\bar{A}^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$ is a mod p solution of the A-hypergeometric system with parameter $\beta = pu - v$ (or, equivalently, $\beta = -v$ since we have reduced modulo p).

3. The zeta function

To make a connection between the matrix $A(\Lambda)$ and the zeta function (1.2), we apply a consequence of the Dwork trace formula developed in [3] (see Equation (3.5) below). Let γ_0 be a zero of the series $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} t^{p^i}/p^i$ having $\operatorname{ord}_p \gamma_0 = 1/(p-1)$, where ord_p is the p-adic valuation normalized by $\operatorname{ord}_p p = 1$. Let L_0 be the space of series

$$L_0 = \left\{ \sum_{u \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2}} c_u \gamma_0^{pu_{n+1}} x^u \mid \sum_{i=0}^{n} u_i - du_{n+1} = 0,\ c_u \in \mathbb{C}_p, \text{ and } \{c_u\} \text{ is bounded} \right\}.$$

For $I \subseteq \{0, \ldots, n\}$, let L_0^I be the subset of L_0 defined by

$$L_0^I = \left\{ \sum_{u \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2}} c_u \gamma_0^{pu_{n+1}} x^u \in L_0 \mid u_i > 0 \text{ for } i \in I \right\}.$$

Let $\mathrm{AH}(t) = \exp(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} t^{p^i}/p^i)$ be the Artin-Hasse series, a power series in t that has p-integral coefficients, and set

$$\theta(t) = \mathrm{AH}(\gamma_0 t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \theta_i t^i.$$

We then have

$$\operatorname{ord}_p \theta_i \geq \frac{i}{p-1}. \tag{3.1}$$

We define the Frobenius operator on L_0. Put

$$\theta(\hat{\lambda}, x) = \prod_{j=1}^{N} \theta(\hat{\lambda}_j x^{\mathbf{a}_j^+}), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\hat{\lambda}$ denotes the Teichmüller lifting of λ. We shall also need to consider the series $\theta_0(\hat{\lambda}, x)$ defined by

$$\theta_0(\hat{\lambda}, x) = \prod_{i=0}^{a-1} \prod_{j=1}^{N} \theta\big((\hat{\lambda}_j x^{\mathbf{a}_j^+})^{p^i}\big) = \prod_{i=0}^{a-1} \theta(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i}, x^{p^i}). \tag{3.3}$$

Define an operator ψ on formal power series by

$$\psi\Big(\sum_{u \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2}} c_u x^u\Big) = \sum_{u \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2}} c_{pu} x^u. \tag{3.4}$$

Denote by $\alpha_{\hat{\lambda}}$ the composition

$$\alpha_{\hat{\lambda}} := \psi^a \circ \text{“multiplication by } \theta_0(\hat{\lambda}, x)\text{.”}$$

The map $\alpha_{\hat{\lambda}}$ operates on L_0 and is stable on each L_0^I. The proof of Theorem 1.4 will be based on the following formula for the rational function $P_\lambda(t)$ defined in (1.2). By [3, Equation 7.12] we have

$$P_\lambda(qt) = \prod_{I \subseteq \{0,1,\dots,n\}} \det(I - q^{n+1-|I|} t \alpha_{\hat{\lambda}} \mid L_0^I)^{(-1)^{n+1+|I|}}. \tag{3.5}$$

To exploit (3.5) we shall need p-adic estimates for the action of $\alpha_{\hat{\lambda}}$ on L_0^I. Expand (3.3) as a series in x, say,

$$\theta_0(\hat{\lambda}, x) = \sum_{w \in \mathbb{N}A} \theta_{0,w}(\hat{\lambda}) x^w. \tag{3.6}$$

Note that from the definitions we have $\theta_{0,w}(\hat{\lambda}) \in \mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_{q-1}, \gamma_0)$. A direct calculation shows that for $v \in U^I$,

$$\alpha_{\hat{\lambda}}(x^v) = \sum_{u \in U^I} \theta_{0,qu-v}(\hat{\lambda}) x^u, \tag{3.7}$$

thus we need p-adic estimates for the $\theta_{0,qu-v}(\hat{\lambda})$ with $u, v \in U^I$.

Expand (3.2) as a series in x:

$$\theta(\hat{\lambda}, x) = \sum_{w \in \mathbb{N}A} \theta_w(\hat{\lambda}) x^w, \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\theta_w(\hat{\lambda}) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^N} \theta_\nu^{(w)} \hat{\lambda}^\nu \tag{3.9}$$

with

$$\theta_\nu^{(w)} = \begin{cases} \prod_{j=1}^N \theta_{\nu_j} & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = w, \\ 0 & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ \neq w. \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

From (3.1) we have the estimate

$$\operatorname{ord}_p \theta_\nu^{(w)} \geq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j}{p-1} = \frac{w_{n+1}}{p-1}. \tag{3.11}$$

In particular, this implies the estimate

$$\operatorname{ord}_p \theta_w(\hat{\lambda}) \geq \frac{w_{n+1}}{p-1}. \tag{3.12}$$

By (3.3) and (3.8) we have

$$\theta_{0,w}(\hat{\lambda}) = \sum_{\substack{u^{(0)}, \ldots, u^{(a-1)} \in \mathbb{N}A \\ \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} p^i u^{(i)} = w}} \prod_{i=0}^{a-1} \theta_{u^{(i)}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i}). \tag{3.13}$$

In particular, we get the formula

$$\theta_{0,qu-v}(\hat{\lambda}) = \sum_{\substack{w^{(0)}, \ldots, w^{(a-1)} \in \mathbb{N}A \\ \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} p^i w^{(i)} = qu-v}} \prod_{i=0}^{a-1} \theta_{w^{(i)}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i}). \tag{3.14}$$

Applying (3.12) to the products on the right-hand side of (3.14) gives

$$\operatorname{ord}_p \left(\prod_{i=1}^{a-1} \theta_{w^{(i)}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i}) \right) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \frac{w_{n+1}^{(i)}}{p-1}. \tag{3.15}$$

This estimate is not directly helpful for estimating $\theta_{0,qu-v}(\hat{\lambda})$ because we lack information about the $w^{(i)}$. Instead we proceed as follows.

Fix $w^{(0)}, \ldots, w^{(a-1)} \in \mathbb{N}A$ with

$$\sum_{i=0}^{a-1} p^i w^{(i)} = qu - v. \tag{3.16}$$

We construct inductively from $\{w^{(i)}\}_{i=0}^{a-1}$ a related sequence $\{\tilde{w}^{(i)}\}_{i=0}^{a} \subseteq U^I$ such that

$$w^{(i)} = p\tilde{w}^{(i+1)} - \tilde{w}^{(i)} \quad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, a-1. \tag{3.17}$$

First of all, take $\tilde{w}^{(0)} = v$. Eq. (3.16) shows that $w^{(0)} + \tilde{w}^{(0)} = p\tilde{w}^{(1)}$ for some $\tilde{w}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+2}$; since $w^{(0)} \in \mathbb{N}A$ and $\tilde{w}^{(0)} \in U^I$ we conclude that $\tilde{w}^{(1)} \in U^I$. Suppose that for some $0 < k \le a-1$ we have defined $\tilde{w}^{(0)}, \dots, \tilde{w}^{(k)} \in U^I$ satisfying (3.17) for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$. Substituting $p\tilde{w}^{(i+1)} - \tilde{w}^{(i)}$ for $w^{(i)}$ for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$ in (3.16) gives

$$-\tilde{w}^{(0)} + p^k\tilde{w}^{(k)} + \sum_{i=k}^{a-1} p^i w^{(i)} = p^a u - v. \tag{3.18}$$

Since $\tilde{w}^{(0)} = v$, we can divide this equation by p^k to get $\tilde{w}^{(k)} + w^{(k)} = p\tilde{w}^{(k+1)}$ for some $\tilde{w}^{(k+1)} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+2}$. Since $w^{(k)} \in \mathbb{N}A$ and (by induction) $\tilde{w}^{(k)} \in U^I$, we conclude that $\tilde{w}^{(k+1)} \in U^I$. This completes the inductive construction. Note that in the special case $k = a-1$, this computation gives $\tilde{w}^{(a)} = u$.

Summing Eq. (3.17) over $i = 0, \dots, a-1$ and using $\tilde{w}^{(0)} = v$, $\tilde{w}^{(a)} = u$, gives

$$\sum_{i=0}^{a-1} w^{(i)} = pu - v + (p-1)\sum_{i=1}^{a-1} \tilde{w}^{(i)}, \tag{3.19}$$

hence

$$\sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \frac{w_{n+1}^{(i)}}{p-1} = \frac{pu_{n+1} - v_{n+1}}{p-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{a-1} \tilde{w}_{n+1}^{(i)}. \tag{3.20}$$

For $w^{(0)}, \dots, w^{(a-1)}$ as in (3.16), we thus get from (3.15)

$$\operatorname{ord}_p \left(\prod_{i=0}^{a-1} \theta_{w^{(i)}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i}) \right) \ge \frac{pu_{n+1} - v_{n+1}}{p-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{a-1} \tilde{w}_{n+1}^{(i)}. \tag{3.21}$$

Since $\tilde{w}^{(i)} \in U^I$, we have

$$\tilde{w}_{n+1}^{(i)} = \mu_I + 1 \text{ if } \tilde{w}^{(i)} \in U^I_{\min} \text{ and } \tilde{w}_{n+1}^{(i)} \ge \mu_I + 2 \text{ if } \tilde{w}^{(i)} \notin U^I_{\min}. \tag{3.22}$$

From (3.21) and (3.22) we get the following result.

Lemma 3.23. *For $u, v \in U^I$ and $w^{(0)}, \dots, w^{(a-1)}$ as in* (3.16)*, we have*

$$\operatorname{ord}_p \left(\prod_{i=0}^{a-1} \theta_{w^{(i)}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i}) \right) \ge \frac{pu_{n+1} - v_{n+1}}{p-1} + (a-1)(\mu_I + 1). \tag{3.24}$$

Furthermore, if any of the terms $\tilde{w}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{w}^{(a-1)}$ *of the associated sequence satisfying* (3.17) *is not contained in* $U^I_{\min}$*, then*

$$\operatorname{ord}_p\left(\prod_{i=0}^{a-1}\theta_{w^{(i)}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i})\right) \geq \frac{pu_{n+1}-v_{n+1}}{p-1} + (a-1)(\mu_I+1)+1. \tag{3.25}$$

Our desired estimate for $\theta_{0,qu-v}(\hat{\lambda})$ now follows from (3.14).

Corollary 3.26. *For* $u, v \in U^I$ *we have*

$$\operatorname{ord}_p \theta_{0,qu-v}(\hat{\lambda}) \geq \frac{pu_{n+1}-v_{n+1}}{p-1} + (a-1)(\mu_I+1). \tag{3.27}$$

4. The action of $\alpha_{\hat{\lambda}}$ on L^I_0

In this section, we use Corollary 3.26 to study the action of $\alpha_{\hat{\lambda}}$ on L^I_0. From (3.7) and the formula of Serre[8, Proposition 7] we have

$$\det(I - t\alpha_{\hat{\lambda}} \mid L^I_0) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a^I_m t^m, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$a^I_m = (-1)^m \sum_{U_m \subseteq U^I} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_m} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{u \in U_m} \theta_{0,qu-\sigma(u)}(\hat{\lambda}) \in \mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_{q-1}, \gamma_0), \tag{4.2}$$

the outer sum is over all subsets $U_m \subseteq U^I$ of cardinality m, and $\mathcal{S}_m$ is the group of permutations on m objects.

Proposition 4.3. *The coefficient* a^I_m *is divisible by* $q^{m(\mu_I+1)}$ *and satisfies the congruence*

$$a^I_m \equiv (-1)^m \sum_{U_m \subseteq U^I_{\min}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_m} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{u \in U_m} \theta_{0,qu-\sigma(u)}(\hat{\lambda}) \pmod{pq^{m(\mu_I+1)}}. \tag{4.4}$$

In particular, $a^I_m \equiv 0 \pmod{pq^{m(\mu_I+1)}}$ *if* $m > |U^I_{\min}|$.

Proof. If $U_m \subseteq U^I$ is a subset of cardinality m and σ is a permutation of U_m, then by (3.27)

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ord}_p\Big(\prod_{u \in U_m} \theta_{0,qu-\sigma(u)}(\hat{\lambda})\Big) &\geq m(a-1)(\mu_I+1) + \sum_{u \in U_m} \frac{pu_{n+1}-\sigma(u)_{n+1}}{p-1} \\
&= m(a-1)(\mu_I+1) + \sum_{u \in U_m} u_{n+1} \\
&\geq ma(\mu_I+1)
\end{aligned}$$

since $u \in U_m$ implies $u_{n+1} \geq \mu_I + 1$. It follows from (4.2) that a_m^I is divisible by $q^{m(\mu_I+1)}$. Furthermore, $u_{n+1} \geq \mu_I + 2$ if $u \notin U_{\min}^I$, so

$$\operatorname{ord}_p\biggl(\prod_{u\in U_m} \theta_{0,qu-\sigma(u)}(\hat\lambda)\biggr) \geq ma(\mu_I+1)+1 \quad \text{if } U_m \not\subseteq U_{\min}^I.$$

The congruence (4.4) now follows from (4.2). □

As an immediate corollary of Proposition 4.3, we have the following result.

Corollary 4.5. *The reciprocal roots of* $\det(I - t\alpha_{\hat\lambda} \mid L_0^I)$ *are all divisible by* q^{μ_I+1}.

Corollary 4.5 allows us to analyze the terms on the right-hand side of (3.5).

Proposition 4.6. *The reciprocal roots of* $\det(I - q^{n+1-|I|}t\alpha_{\hat\lambda} \mid L_0^I)$ *are divisible by* $q^{\mu+2}$ *unless either* $|I| = n+1$ *or* $|I| = n$ *and* n *is divisible by* d*, in which case they are divisible by* $q^{\mu+1}$.

Proof. Corollary 4.5 and the definition of μ_I imply that the reciprocal roots of $\det(I - q^{n+1-|I|}t\alpha_{\hat\lambda} \mid L_0^I)$ are divisible by q to the power

$$n + 1 - |I| + \left\lceil \frac{|I|}{d} \right\rceil. \tag{4.7}$$

If $|I| = n+1$, this reduces to $\mu + 1$. Suppose $|I| = n$. From the definition of μ we have $n = \mu d + r$ with $0 \leq r \leq d-1$. The expression (4.7) then reduces to $1 + \lceil (\mu d + r)/d \rceil$, which equals $\mu + 2$ if $r > 0$ and equals $\mu + 1$ if $r = 0$.

If $|I| = n-1$, expression (4.7) reduces to $2 + \lceil (\mu d + r - 1)/d \rceil$, which equals $\mu + 3$ if $r > 1$ and equals $\mu + 2$ if $r = 0, 1$. Finally, note that expression (4.7) cannot decrease when $|I|$ decreases, so expression (4.7) will be $\geq \mu + 2$ for $|I| < n - 1$. □

From (3.5) and Proposition 4.6 we get the following result.

Proposition 4.8. *If* n *is not divisible by* d*, then*

$$P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv \det(I - q^{-\mu-1}t\alpha_{\hat\lambda} \mid L_0^S) \pmod q. \tag{4.9}$$

If n *is divisible by* d*, then*

$$P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv \frac{\det(I - q^{-\mu-1}t\alpha_{\hat\lambda} \mid L_0^S)}{\prod_{i=0}^n \det(I - q^{-\mu}t\alpha_{\hat\lambda} \mid L_0^{S\setminus\{i\}})} \pmod q. \tag{4.10}$$

5. Proof of Theorem 1.4

It follows from (4.9) that $R_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$ if n is not divisible by d. To establish Theorem 1.4, it remains to prove the congruence for $Q_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t)$.

Consider the matrix $B^I(\hat{\lambda}) = [B^I_{uv}(\hat{\lambda})]_{u,v\in U^I_{\min}}$ defined by

$$B^I_{uv}(\hat{\lambda}) = \theta_{0,qu-v}(\hat{\lambda}).$$

We have

$$\det\left(I - tB^I(\hat{\lambda})\right) = \sum_{m=0}^{|U^I_{\min}|} b^I_m t^m, \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$b^I_m = (-1)^m \sum_{U_m\subseteq U^I_{\min}} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{S}_m} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{u\in U_m} \theta_{0,qu-\sigma(u)}(\hat{\lambda}). \tag{5.2}$$

Proposition 4.3 implies $b^I_m \equiv 0 \pmod{q^{m(\mu_I+1)}}$ and

$$b^I_m \equiv a^I_m \pmod{pq^{m(\mu_I+1)}},$$

which establishes the following result.

Proposition 5.3. *We have*

$$\det(I - q^{-\mu_I-1}t\alpha_{\hat{\lambda}} \mid L^I_0) \equiv \det(I - q^{-\mu_I-1}tB^I(\hat{\lambda})) \pmod{p}.$$

Combined with Proposition 4.8, this gives the following congruences.

Corollary 5.4. *If n is not divisible by d, then*

$$P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv \det\left(I - q^{-\mu-1}tB^S(\hat{\lambda})\right) \pmod{p}. \tag{5.5}$$

If n is divisible by d, then

$$P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv \frac{\det\left(I - q^{-\mu-1}tB^S(\hat{\lambda})\right)}{\prod_{i=0}^{n}\det\left(I - q^{-\mu}tB^{S\setminus\{i\}}(\hat{\lambda})\right)} \pmod{p}. \tag{5.6}$$

To simplify (5.5) and (5.6) further, we restate Lemma 3.23 in the special case where $u, v \in U^I_{\min}$, i.e., $u_{n+1} = v_{n+1} = \mu_I + 1$.

Lemma 5.7. *For $u, v \in U^I_{\min}$ and $w^{(0)}, \ldots, w^{(a-1)}$ as in (3.16), we have*

$$\operatorname{ord}_p\left(\prod_{i=0}^{a-1}\theta_{w^{(i)}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i})\right) \geq a(\mu_I+1). \tag{5.8}$$

Furthermore, if any of the terms $\tilde{w}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{w}^{(a-1)}$ *of the associated sequence satisfying* (3.17) *is not contained in* $U^I_{\min}$*, then*

$$\operatorname{ord}_p \left(\prod_{i=0}^{a-1} \theta_{w^{(i)}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i}) \right) \geq a(\mu_I + 1) + 1. \tag{5.9}$$

Applying Lemma 5.7 to Equations (3.14) and (3.17) gives the following congruence: for $u, v \in U^I_{\min}$,

$$\theta_{0,qu-v}(\hat{\lambda}) \equiv \sum_{\substack{\tilde{w}^{(1)},\dots,\tilde{w}^{(a-1)} \in U_{I,\min} \\ \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} p^i(p\tilde{w}^{(i+1)} - \tilde{w}^{(i)}) = qu-v}} \prod_{i=0}^{a-1} \theta_{p\tilde{w}^{(i+1)} - \tilde{w}^{(i)}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^i}) \pmod{pq^{\mu_I+1}}, \tag{5.10}$$

where $\tilde{w}^{(0)} = v$ and $\tilde{w}^{(a)} = u$.

Let $C^I(\hat{\lambda}) = [C^I_{uv}(\hat{\lambda})]_{u,v \in U_{I,\min}}$ be the matrix

$$C^I_{uv}(\hat{\lambda}) = \theta_{pu-v}(\hat{\lambda}).$$

It is straightforward to check by induction on a that the right-hand side of (5.10) is the (u, v)-entry in the matrix product

$$C^I(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-1}}) C^I(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots C^I(\hat{\lambda}),$$

i.e., (5.10) implies the matrix congruence

$$B^I(\hat{\lambda}) \equiv C^I(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-1}}) C^I(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots C^I(\hat{\lambda}) \pmod{pq^{\mu_I+1}}. \tag{5.11}$$

We make explicit the matrix $C^I(\hat{\lambda})$. Let $u, v \in U^I_{\min}$. From (3.9) and (3.10) we have

$$\theta_{pu-v}(\hat{\lambda}) = \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^N \\ \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = pu-v}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N \theta_{\nu_j} \right) \hat{\lambda}^\nu. \tag{5.12}$$

Since $u, v \in U^I_{\min}$, Lemma 2.1 implies that $\nu_j \leq p-1$ for all j in the sum on the right-hand side of (5.12). It then follows from the definition of $\theta(t)$ that $\theta_{\nu_j} = \gamma_0^{\nu_j}/\nu_j!$. Examining the last coordinate of the equation $\sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = pu - v$ gives $\sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j = (p-1)(\mu_I + 1)$, so (5.12) can be simplified to

$$\theta_{pu-v}(\hat{\lambda}) = \gamma_0^{(p-1)(\mu_I+1)} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^N \\ \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = pu-v}} \frac{\hat{\lambda}^\nu}{\nu_1! \cdots \nu_N!}. \tag{5.13}$$

Using (2.3), we obtain the relation between the matrices $C^I(\hat{\lambda})$ and $A^I(\Lambda)$:

$$C^I(\hat{\lambda}) = (-\gamma_0^{p-1})^{\mu_I+1} A^I(\hat{\lambda}). \tag{5.14}$$

From (5.11), we then obtain a relation between $A^I(\hat{\lambda})$ and $B^I(\hat{\lambda})$:

$$B^I(\hat{\lambda}) \equiv (-\gamma_0^{p-1})^{a(\mu_I+1)} A^I(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-1}}) A^I(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots A^I(\hat{\lambda}) \pmod{pq^{\mu_I+1}}. \tag{5.15}$$

Recall that $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma_0^{p^i}/p^i = 0$ and that $\mathrm{ord}_p \gamma_0 = 1/p-1$. In particular,

$$\mathrm{ord}_p \frac{\gamma_0^{p^i}}{p^i} = \frac{p^i}{p-1} - i,$$

and since the right-hand side of this expression is an increasing function of i for $i \geq 1$ we have

$$\gamma_0 + \frac{\gamma_0^p}{p} \equiv 0 \pmod{\gamma_0 p^{p-1}}.$$

Multiplying by p/γ_0 then gives

$$-\gamma_0^{p-1} \equiv p \pmod{p^p}.$$

It follows from this that

$$(-\gamma_0^{p-1})^{a(\mu_I+1)} \equiv q^{\mu_I+1} \pmod{pq^{\mu_I+1}},$$

so (5.15) may be simplified to

$$B^I(\hat{\lambda}) \equiv q^{\mu_I+1} A^I(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-1}}) A^I(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots A^I(\hat{\lambda}) \pmod{pq^{\mu_I+1}}. \tag{5.16}$$

Corollary 5.4 now implies the following congruences.

Theorem 5.17. *If n is not divisible by d, then*

$$P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv \det\left(I - tA^S(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-1}}) A^S(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots A^S(\hat{\lambda})\right) \pmod{p}. \tag{5.18}$$

If n is divisible by d, then

$$P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv \frac{\det\left(I - tA^S(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-1}}) A^S(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots A^S(\hat{\lambda})\right)}{\prod_{i=0}^{n} \det\left(I - tA^{S\setminus\{i\}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-1}}) A^{S\setminus\{i\}}(\hat{\lambda}^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots A^{S\setminus\{i\}}(\hat{\lambda})\right)} \pmod{p}. \tag{5.19}$$

Since $A^S(\Lambda)$ is the matrix denoted $A(\Lambda)$ in the Introduction and since $\hat{\lambda}$ is the Teichmüller lifting of λ we have $A^S(\hat{\lambda}) \equiv \bar{A}^S(\lambda) \pmod{p}$. Theorem 1.4 now follows from (5.18), and (5.19) is equivalent to

$$P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv \frac{\det\left(I - t\bar{A}^S(\lambda^{p^{a-1}}) \bar{A}^S(\lambda^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots \bar{A}^S(\lambda)\right)}{\prod_{i=0}^{n} \det\left(I - t\bar{A}^{S\setminus\{i\}}(\lambda^{p^{a-1}}) \bar{A}^{S\setminus\{i\}}(\lambda^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots \bar{A}^{S\setminus\{i\}}(\lambda)\right)} \pmod{p}. \tag{5.20}$$

6. The case $d \,|\, n$

We first give an example to show that Theorem 1.4 fails when $d \,|\, n$. Consider the variety X in $\mathbb{P}^n$ defined by the equation $x_1 \cdots x_n = 0$ (so we have $d = n$ and $\mu = 1$). A short calculation shows that its zeta function $Z(X,t)$ has the form (1.2) with

$$P(t)^{(-1)^n} = \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 - q^j t)^{(-1)^{n-j}\binom{n-1}{j-1}}.$$

In particular, we have $R(q^{-1}t) \equiv (1-t) \pmod{q}$, contradicting Theorem 1.4.

An elementary observation will allow us to simplify the denominator of (5.20). Assume that $d \,|\, n$ and $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. Then

$$\mu_{S\setminus\{i\}} + 1 = \left\lceil \frac{n}{d} \right\rceil = \mu.$$

This implies that $U_{\min}^{S\setminus\{i\}}$ is a singleton: $U_{\min}^{S\setminus\{i\}} = \{u^{(i)}\}$, where

$$u^{(i)} = (1, \dots, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 1, \mu) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2}$$

with zero in the i-th entry. It follows that if we define a polynomial $g_i(\Lambda) \in (\mathbb{Q} \cap \mathbb{Z}_p)[\Lambda]$ by the formula

$$g_i(\Lambda) = (-1)^\mu \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^N \\ \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \mathbf{a}_j^+ = (p-1)u^{(i)}}} \frac{\Lambda_1^{\nu_1} \cdots \Lambda_N^{\nu_N}}{\nu_1! \cdots \nu_N!}, \tag{6.1}$$

then by (2.3), $A^{S\setminus\{i\}}(\Lambda)$ is a one-by-one matrix with entry $g_i(\Lambda)$. From (5.20) we then have the following result.

Theorem 6.2. *If $d \,|\, n$, then*

$$P_\lambda(q^{-\mu}t) \equiv \frac{\det\left(I - t\bar{A}^S(\lambda^{p^{a-1}})\bar{A}^S(\lambda^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots \bar{A}^S(\lambda)\right)}{\prod_{i=0}^n \left(1 - t\bar{g}_i(\lambda^{p^{a-1}})\bar{g}_i(\lambda^{p^{a-2}}) \cdots \bar{g}_i(\lambda)\right)} \pmod{p}. \tag{6.3}$$

7. Generic invertibility of $\bar{A}^I(\Lambda)$

The proof of generic invertibility follows the lines of our recent proof of generic invertibility for the Hasse-Witt matrix[2]. We fix I and prove that the matrix $\bar{A}^I(\Lambda)$ is generically invertible, in a sense made precise below.

We consider the following condition on the set $\{\mathbf{a}_j\}_{j=1}^N$. Suppose that $N \geq \mu_I + |U_{\min}^I|$ and that the elements $\{\mathbf{a}_j\}_{j=1}^{\mu_I}$ and $\{\mathbf{a}_j\}_{j=\mu_I+1}^{\mu_I+|U_{\min}^I|}$ have the following property:

Hypothesis 7.1. *For each $u \in U^I_{\min}$, there exists (a necessarily unique) k_u, $1 \le k_u \le |U^I_{\min}|$, such that $x^u = x^{\mathbf{a}^+_{\mu_I+k_u}} \prod_{j=1}^{\mu_I} x^{\mathbf{a}^+_j}$.*

We show that such subsets always exists when, for example, $\{x^{\mathbf{a}_j}\}_{j=1}^N$ consists of all monomials of degree d. To fix ideas and simplify notation, suppose that $|I| = h$, $0 \le h \le n+1$ and that $I = \{0, 1, \dots, h-1\}$. For $j = 1, \dots, \mu_I$ we take $x^{\mathbf{a}_j} = \prod_{k=(j-1)d}^{jd-1} x_k$ and we take $\{x^{\mathbf{a}_j}\}_{j=\mu_I+1}^{\mu_I+|U^I_{\min}|}$ to consist of all monomials of degree d that are divisible by the product $x_{\mu_I d} \cdots x_{h-1}$. Then Hypothesis 7.1 is satisfied.

Theorem 7.2. *If $\{\mathbf{a}_j\}_{j=1}^N$ satisfies Hypothesis 7.1, then the matrix $\bar{A}^I(\Lambda)$ is invertible.*

We begin with a reduction step. Define a related matrix $D^I(\Lambda) = [D^I_{uv}(\Lambda)]_{u,v \in U^I_{\min}}$ by setting

$$D^I_{uv}(\Lambda) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{\mu_I} \Lambda_j \right)^{-(p-1)} \Lambda^{-p}_{\mu_I+k_u} \Lambda_{\mu_I+k_v} A^I_{uv}(\Lambda) \in$$

$$\Lambda^{-1}_{\mu_I+k_u} \Lambda_{\mu_I+k_v} (\mathbb{Q} \cap \mathbb{Z}_p)[\Lambda_1^{-1}, \dots, \Lambda_{\mu_I}^{-1}, \Lambda^{-1}_{\mu_I+k_u}, \Lambda_{\mu_I+2}, \dots, \hat{\Lambda}_{\mu_I+k_u}, \dots, \Lambda_N],$$

where $A^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$ is given by (2.3). In other words, we obtain $D^I(\Lambda)$ by multiplying row u of $A^I(\Lambda)$ by $\left(\Lambda_{\mu_I+k_u} \prod_{j=1}^{\mu_I} \Lambda_j\right)^{-p}$ and multiplying column v of $A^I(\Lambda)$ by $\Lambda_{\mu_I+k_v} \prod_{j=1}^{\mu_I} \Lambda_j$. It follows that

(7.3)
$$\det D^I(\Lambda) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{\mu_I} \Lambda_j \right)^{-(p-1)|U^I_{\min}|} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|U^I_{\min}|} \Lambda_{\mu_I+j} \right)^{-(p-1)} \det A^I(\Lambda),$$

hence to prove Theorem 7.2 it suffices to prove that

$$\det \bar{D}^I(\Lambda) \neq 0. \tag{7.4}$$

For $u \in U^I_{\min}$, put

$$L_u = \Bigg\{ l = (l_1, \dots, l_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N \mid \sum_{k=1}^N l_k \mathbf{a}^+_k = \mathbf{0},$$
$$l_j \le 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, \mu_I \text{ and } j = \mu_I + k_u,\ l_j \ge 0 \text{ otherwise} \Bigg\}.$$

Lemma 7.5. *If the monomial Λ^l appears in the Laurent polynomial $D^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$, then $l \in L_u$.*

Proof. It follows from Hypothesis 7.1 that

$$u = \mathbf{a}^+_{\mu_I+k_u} + \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_I} \mathbf{a}^+_j \quad \text{and} \quad v = \mathbf{a}^+_{\mu_I+k_v} + \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_I} \mathbf{a}^+_j.$$

The formula for $A^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$ is given in (2.3), where each exponent ν_j satisfies $0 \le \nu_j \le p-1$ by Lemma 2.1. The assertion of Lemma 7.5 now follows from the definition of $D^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$. □

Lemma 7.6. *The Laurent polynomial $D^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$ has no constant term if $u \ne v$ and has constant term equal to $\big(-(p-1)!\big)^{-(\mu_I+1)}$ if $u = v$.*

Proof. If $u \ne v$, the definition of $D^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$ shows that every monomial in $D^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$ contains a negative power of $\Lambda_{\mu_I+k_u}$ and a positive power of $\Lambda_{\mu_I+k_v}$. If $u = v$, then

$$pu - v = (p-1)u = (p-1)\biggl(\mathbf{a}^+_{\mu_I+k_u} + \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_I} \mathbf{a}^+_j\biggr),$$

so (2.3) shows that the monomial

$$(-1)^{\mu_I+1} \frac{\bigl(\Lambda_{\mu_I+k_u} \prod_{j=1}^{\mu_I} \Lambda_j\bigr)^{p-1}}{(p-1)!^{\mu_I+1}}$$

appears in $A^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$. The assertion of the lemma then follows from the definition of $D^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$. □

We shall prove (7.4) by showing that $\det \bar{D}^I(\Lambda)$ has a nonzero constant term. In fact, we shall show that the constant term of $\det D^I(\Lambda)$ is a p-adic unit. By Lemma 7.5 and the following proposition, the constant term of $\det D^I(\Lambda)$ is the determinant of the matrix whose (u,v)-entry is the constant term of $D^I_{uv}(\Lambda)$. And by Lemma 7.6, this matrix of constant terms is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are p-adic units. Thus the following proposition completes the proof of (7.4).

Proposition 7.7. *Let $l^{(u)} = (l^{(u)}_1, \dots, l^{(u)}_N) \in L_u$ for $u \in U^I_{\min}$. One has*

$$\sum_{u \in U^I_{\min}} l^{(u)} = \mathbf{0} \tag{7.8}$$

if and only if $l^{(u)} = \mathbf{0}$ for all $u \in U^I_{\min}$.

Proof. The "if" part of the proposition is clear, so consider a set $\{l^{(u)}\}_{u\in U^I_{\min}}$ with $l^{(u)} \in L_u$ satisfying (7.8). Since $l^{(u)} \in L_u$ we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} l^{(u)}_k \mathbf{a}^+_k = \mathbf{0}, \tag{7.9}$$

which implies (since the last coordinate of each $\mathbf{a}^+_k$ equals 1)

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} l^{(u)}_k = 0. \tag{7.10}$$

From the definition of L_u, we have $l^{(u)}_j \le 0$ for all u if $j \le \mu_I$ and $l^{(u)}_j \ge 0$ for all u if $j \ge \mu_I + |U^I_{\min}| + 1$, so (7.8) implies that

$$l^{(u)}_j = 0 \text{ for all } u \text{ and all } j \le \mu_I \tag{7.11}$$

and

$$l^{(u)}_j = 0 \text{ for all } u \text{ and all } j \ge \mu_I + |U^I_{\min}| + 1. \tag{7.12}$$

To establish the proposition, it remains to show that $l^{(u)}_j = 0$ for all u if $\mu_I + 1 \le j \le \mu_I + |U^I_{\min}|$.

Using (7.11) and (7.12), Equations (7.9) and (7.10) become

$$\sum_{k=1}^{|U^I_{\min}|} l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k} \mathbf{a}^+_k = \mathbf{0} \tag{7.13}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{|U^I_{\min}|} l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k} = 0 \tag{7.14}$$

for all u. Since $l^{(u)} \in L_u$, we have $l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k_u} \le 0$ and $l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k} \ge 0$ if $k \ne k_u$. If $l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k_u} = 0$, then (7.14) implies that $l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k} = 0$ for $k \ne k_u$ as well, so $l^{(u)} = \mathbf{0}$.

If follows that if $l^{(u)} \ne \mathbf{0}$, then $l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k_u} < 0$ so we can solve (7.13) for $\mathbf{a}^+_{k_u}$:

$$\mathbf{a}^+_{k_u} = \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k\ne k_u}}^{|U^I_{\min}|} \left(-\frac{l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k}}{l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k_u}} \right) \mathbf{a}^+_k. \tag{7.15}$$

The coefficients on the right-hand side of (7.15) are nonnegative rational numbers that sum to 1, so (7.15) implies the following statement.

Lemma 7.16. *If $l^{(u)} \neq \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathbf{a}^+_{k_u}$ is an interior point of the convex hull of the set $\{\mathbf{a}^+_k \mid l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k} > 0\}$.*

Let $Z = \{\mathbf{a}^+_k \mid l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k} \neq 0 \text{ for some } u \in U^I_{\min}\}$. If $\mathbf{a}^+_k \notin Z$, then $l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k} = 0$ for all $u \in U^I_{\min}$, so if $Z = \emptyset$ then $l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k} = 0$ for all k, $1 \le k \le |U^I_{\min}|$, and all $u \in U^I_{\min}$, which establishes the proposition. So suppose $Z \neq \emptyset$ and choose k_0, $1 \le k_0 \le |U^I_{\min}|$, such that $\mathbf{a}^+_{k_0}$ is a vertex of the convex hull of Z. If $l^{(u)} \neq \mathbf{0}$, then Lemma 7.16 implies that $k_0 \neq k_u$. By the definition of L_u, we therefore have $l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k_0} \ge 0$ for all $u \in U^I_{\min}$. Furthermore, since $\mathbf{a}^+_{k_0} \in Z$, we must have $l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k_0} > 0$ for some $u \in U^I_{\min}$. It follows that $\sum_{u \in U^I_{\min}} l^{(u)}_{\mu_I+k_0} > 0$, contradicting (7.8). Thus we must have $Z = \emptyset$. □

References

[1] A. Adolphson and S. Sperber. Hasse invariants and mod p solutions of A-hypergeometric systems. J. Number Theory **142** (2014), 183–210.

[2] A. Adolphson and S. Sperber. A-hypergeometric series and the Hasse-Witt matrix of a hypersurface. Finite Fields and Their Applications **41** (2016), 55–63.

[3] A. Adolphson and S. Sperber. Distinguished-root formulas for generalized Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces. Preprint, available at `arXiv:1602.03578`.

[4] J. Ax. Zeroes of polynomials over finite fields. Amer. J. Math. **86** (1964), 255–261.

[5] N. Katz. On a theorem of Ax. Amer. J. Math. **93** (1971), 485–499.

[6] N. Katz. Algebraic solutions of differential equations (p-curvature and the Hodge filtration). Invent. Math. **18** (1972), 1–118.

[7] N. Katz. Une formule de congruence pour la fonction ζ. Exposé XXII in S. G. A. 7 II, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 340, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1973.

[8] J.-P. Serre. Endomorphismes complètement continus des espaces de Banach p-adiques. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. No. 12 (1962), 69–85.

Department of Mathematics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078

E-mail address: `adolphs@math.okstate.edu`

School of Mathematics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

E-mail address: `sperber@math.umn.edu`